

cause the Senate conferees were strongly of the opinion that in good conscience they could not accept the House amendments.

The amendment which was at the root of this stalemate, and which necessitated my emphatic opposition to the House version of the bill, was the now famous Westland amendment. This language, inserted in the bill by the House Interior Committee as section 8 of the bill, specified:

No electric transmission lines or facilities shall be constructed outside the Pacific Northwest by any Federal agency for the purpose of transmitting electric energy for sale or exchange pursuant to this act except those lines and facilities hereafter specifically authorized by Congress.

This language would have required separate authorization for any and each interregional power transmission line, and would have had the obvious effect of delaying the construction of the Federal portions of the intertie. The advocates of an all-private intertie "package" hoped that the Westland amendment would enable private interests to step in and build all of the lines. As I have pointed out time and time again over the past several months, such an arrangement would have been to the benefit of no one—at least of all the individual electric consumer—except of course the profit-bloated private power monopolies.

Mr. President, it is of the utmost importance that the public power "yardstick" principle be maintained as we move into this new field of interregional power transmission, and the only means by which this principle can be protected is through the existence of public lines to set the rate standard for private service. It is for that reason that I have been unalterably opposed to the Westland amendment to the regional preference bill, because it could only act to decrease the chances that the yardstick principle would be applied to the Intertie.

It was for this same reason, Mr. President, that I opposed the original Intertie "package" submitted by the Secretary of the Interior in June of this year. It contained no guarantee that any of the Intertie lines would be publicly owned, and left the door wide open to the possibility that, in fact, all of the lines would be controlled eventually by private power interests.

I have always been at a loss to understand how the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration could have been drawn in on that gimmick, and why they were willing to use their position to underwrite such an unsound principle. The language contained in the Secretary's original Intertie proposal could have been used to the great disadvantage of the power consumers in the Pacific Northwest, and could have significantly damaged the great power legislation that dates back to the passage of the Bonneville Power Act.

I have expressed before, and I express again, my great disappointment that the Secretary of the Interior would have advocated at any time, even for a moment

of time, this kind of private power steal from the power consumers of the Pacific Northwest. If Mr. Udall continues to act so as to require constant watching, then, in my judgment, the sooner he gets out of the Cabinet, the better it will be for the power consumers of the Pacific Northwest.

As I pointed out in my speech here in the Senate on August 5, Mr. President, if we turn over to a private utility the power generated at a public dam, and if the power taken at damsite is transmitted over private utility transmission lines, we might as well turn the dam over to the private utility. Whoever controls the transmission lines controls the dam, and both the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of Bonneville Power Administration, Mr. Luce, know it. They also know of the great fight that the liberals in the Senate have had to make for well onto 40 years to get approval of the public power yardstick principle. I think it is unfortunate that the two Senators from Oregon had to carry on such a vigorous battle against the proposed program of the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Furthermore, the construction of extra-high-voltage transmission lines between regions, which will be involved in the Oregon-California intertie lines, constitutes pioneering in the transmission of electrical energy. If the private electric utility monopoly had been permitted to be the sole pioneer in this field—and the Secretary of the Interior was willing to permit them to be—public power transmission of this type would have suffered and would probably have been eliminated.

I opposed the original intertie proposal made by Secretary Udall, and on the basis of that opposition, which I share with Senator NEUBERGER and several other colleagues, the intertie "package" was changed so that the "yardstick" principle has been maintained and Pacific Northwest consumers have been protected.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the final form of the intertie proposal, as it was approved by Congress, includes two all-Federal transmission lines, one to Hoover Dam and another down into Central Valley, Calif. Moreover, Mr. President, the committee report on the intertie appropriations contains the provisions that wheeling rates for the private lines are not to exceed the cost of service on the Federal lines, and that any contracts between the Government and private utilities must be made public and lie before the Senate for 60 days before they become effective.

May I point out, Mr. President, that none of these provisions were found in the original proposal submitted by Secretary Udall. They are provisions which the junior Senator from Oregon and I recommended and fought for over the past months. The final form of the intertie "package" contains these recommendations, and for that reason I have supported it.

In the same fashion, I have opposed the Westland amendment to the regional

preference bill. Now, at last, however, the Senate and House conferees have come to a reasonable agreement, which removes the dangers contained in the Westland amendment. Mr. President, in the conference report, this amendment has been changed so as not to apply to the Oregon-California intertie transmission lines. Now the Federal portions of the intertie do not require separate authorization under S. 1007.

With this last alternation the regional preference has become what it was originally meant to be: a means of protecting the individual electric consumer, instead of an instrument of the private power interests.

On August 18, 1964, the House approved the conference report on the regional preference bill. With the Senate's approval of the report today, the last obstacle to the construction of the intertie will be removed, and this monumental project can now be started with the assurance that the interests of the people of the Pacific Northwest, as well as those of electric consumers throughout the Western States, will be truly served rather than undermined.

Mr. President, I have made this speech to keep the record straight. I have also made this speech in answer to the kept press in my State, such as the Portland Oregonian, which always does the journalistic lobbying work for the private power interests. More specifically, it is in answer to the smear editorial which the Oregonian published some time ago and which I answered previously on the floor of the Senate, seeking to give the false impression that the two Senators from Oregon had little to do with the fight that brought about the intertie settlement.

The truth is that it was the two Senators from Oregon, ably assisted by Representative Moss, of California, and other members of the California delegation, who stood up against the attempt of the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, to slip through the Congress an intertie settlement which would have done irreparable damage to the power consumers of the Northwest.

Finally, Mr. President, let me serve notice on the yellow journals of my State that the senior Senator from Oregon intends to continue the fight he has made for 20 years to insure that the power consumers of the Northwest are not fleeced by the private power monopoly interests, even though these interests have had the aid of the Portland Oregonian and other reactionary newspapers in the State.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, before I conclude the final chapter on this proposed legislation, it is gratifying that the ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the distinguished minority whip, was interested in the pending legislation from the very beginning. He played a leading role in making this legislation possible. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he followed through in connection with the appropriations necessary to implement the basic legislation that is being approved today.

I also want to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who, as the ranking member of our committee, contributed greatly to this success we all share today.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

### CUBAN EXPROPRIATION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since 1959, the Castro government has seized over \$1 billion worth of property in Cuba owned by U.S. citizens or companies. The U.S. Government has protested these confiscations and the Cuban Government has been urged to either return the properties to their rightful owners or pay adequate compensation for them, as required by international law. To date, the Cuban Government has neither returned the properties nor offered to pay compensation.

I have corresponded at length with the Department of State on this subject over the past 2 years, and discussed it with Secretary of State Rusk. I am informed that all U.S. efforts to rectify this situation have been completely unsuccessful and I understand that the Department of State, in complete frustration, has no plans for further action at this time.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the U.S. Government should accept this status quo. It is extremely important that American persons and companies be assured that the full power of the U.S. Government under principles of recognized international law will back them up, and assure them of the protection necessary to encourage and to increase investment abroad. Massachusetts companies and citizens lost property under the Cuban expropriation, and I know that other Senators can say the same for citizens and companies in their States. We cannot expect success in urging increased U.S. investments abroad, unless we leave no stone unturned to combat illegal expropriations of U.S. holdings by foreign nations.

The Department of State has taken the position that right and law are on our side, but there is nothing further we can do. I believe that we must continue to try. There is a way, through the United Nations, to do so.

I have recommended to the Department of State that the Cuban expropriation issue be raised in the United Nations. This is one channel we have not tried. After some years of diligent work, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, and certain others, succeeded in drafting a resolution which was accepted by a vote of 87 for, 2 against, and 12 abstentions, entitled "Permanent Sovereignty Over Natural Resources," numbered United Nations Resolution 1803. I quote from the applicable part of the resolution concerning expropriations:

Paragraph 4. Nationalization, expropriation or requisitioning shall be based on grounds or reasons of public utility, secu-

rity or the national interest which are recognized as overriding purely individual or private interests, both domestic and foreign. In such cases the owner shall be paid appropriate compensation, in accordance with the rules in force in the state taking such measures in the exercise of its sovereignty and in accordance with international law. In any case, where the question of compensation gives rise to a controversy, the national jurisdiction of the state taking such measures shall be exhausted. However, upon agreement by sovereign states and other parties concerned, settlement of the dispute should be made through arbitration or international adjudication.

Mr. President, in the absence of success of all direct U.S. efforts to effect restitution or compensation to American owners of seized properties in Cuba, I believe that this issue should be raised in the United Nations under Resolution 1803. The State Department agrees that the Cuban expropriations legally come within the purview of this United Nations resolution, but they argue that raising this issue in the U.N. would cause Cuba to wage propaganda about U.S. overflights over Cuba, and our naval base at Guantanamo Bay. I do not believe that Cuba can bona fide question our aerial surveillance or the treaty rights accruing to the United States under the signed agreements concerning the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay. Furthermore, I do not believe that the United States need fear propagandizing in the United Nations, nor need we apologize for U.S. actions in relation to Cuba.

While it is up to the President and the State Department to conduct our foreign relations, I respectfully submit that Cuban propaganda is no longer news; we have been through that mill.

What is vital is that our citizens' property has been seized. Most of the OAS members have recently and dramatically voted to cut off relations with Cuba. Cuba stands branded as unfit, under the Castro regime, to share in the economic and political life of this hemisphere. Why should we refrain from asserting U.S. citizens' property rights? Not just Massachusetts citizens' property is involved, or property of citizens of other States, but properties of many foreign nationals was also seized.

Let us give these nations an opportunity to join with us in asserting our rights as defined by the United Nations.

Mr. President, the charter of the U.N. was designed to accommodate just such issues as this. Eighty-seven member nations of the U.N. voted for Resolution 1803. If this issue cannot be raised in the U.N., then we can rightly question whether the U.N. is fulfilling the function for which we believed it designed.

In summary, the legal questions concerning expropriation of American property in Cuba are clear. Cuba and the United States, as members of the United Nations, have sworn to uphold the rules and principles on which the United Nations is founded. Negotiations through regular channels have met no success. Let us raise this issue in the United Nations, where I am confident the position of the United States will be supported, and then Cuba can decide whether to flout a specific U.N. resolution

as well as generally accepted international law.

Mr. President, I trust that the State Department will review its decision on this problem so important to many of our citizens. If it will, it may well find a different attitude in the U.N. than was held a few years ago.

Mr. President, I have brought this matter up at this time because I have been considering it for several years, as many Massachusetts citizens are deeply involved in the subject of expropriation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11369) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6910) to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes.

### AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the question of apportionment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator from Vermont desire to take the floor at this time?

Mr. AIKEN. No. I thought that before the vote on this amendment I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that should be done.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.